

**REMARKS**

Entry of this Amendment and reconsideration are respectfully requested in view of the amendments made to the claims and for the remarks made herein.

Claims 1-28 are pending.

Claims 1-8 and 10-28 stand rejected.

Claim 9 is objected to.

Claims 1, 20, 27 and 28 are independent claims.

Claims 1, 19, 20 and 26 have been amended. Claims 1, 8, 25, 27 and 28 have been cancelled, without prejudice.

Claim 29 has been added.

The Information Disclosure Statement is objected to for failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) for not including a concise explanation of the relevance of each patent listed that is not in the English language. Claims 27 and 28 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 13 and 18 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamazaki (USP no. 6, 115, 007). Claims 3, 20-23 and 25-26 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of Lamvik (USP no. 7, 495, 638). Claims 10-12 and 14 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of Akamatsu (USP no. 6, 172, 807). Claims 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of Bass (USP no. 4, 959, 641). Claim 17 and 19 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of Hoshi (USP no. 5,943, 166). Claim 24 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki and Lamvik and further in view of Hoshi.

Claim 9 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

With regard to the documents provided in the Information Disclosure Statement, applicant notes that the two referred to documents have been submitted in their original foreign language form and thanks the Examiner for entering these documents into the

record. Applicant will attempt to translate and provide a concise statement of the teaching during the prosecution of this matter.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in claim 9 and has elected to add claim 29 to the application. Claim 29 represents the incorporation of the subject matter recited in claim 9 into claim 1. Accordingly, no new matter has been added and claim 29 is in a form indicated to be allowable.

With regard to the rejection of claims 27 and 28 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as being indefinite, applicant respectfully disagrees with and explicitly traverses the rejection of the claims. However, in the interest of advancing the prosecution of this matter, independent claims 27 and 28 have been cancelled and removed from further consideration at this time.

Applicant submits that the reason for the rejection is no longer relevant and respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 13 and 18 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Yamazaki (USP no. 6, 115, 007).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with and explicitly traverses the rejection of the claims. However, independent claims 1 and 20 have been amended to further recite the element of "polarising elements of the display panel 20 oriented so as to minimise viewing angle dependence relative to a second axis of the display, where the second axis is orthogonal to the first axis." No new matter has been added. Support for the amendment may be found at least on page 12, lines 25-27 and in cancelled claims 18 and 25.

Although, claim 18 has been rejected based on the teachings of Yamazaki, it will be shown that Yamazaki fails to provide any teaching regarding a second axis and, thus, the subject matter of recited in claim 18 is not disclosed by Yamazaki.

More specifically, in rejecting claim 18, the Office Action refers to col. 3, lines 57-60 and col. 4, lines 6-17 for teaching a y-axis (a second axis). However a review of

these sections reveals that Yamazaki discloses that that "visual horizontal dimension of pixels are identical and represented by a value X. ... It is assumed that a point of view is moved by the horizontal angle of view which is indicated by symbol  $\beta$ . ... In order to obtain the visual horizontal dimension X of pixels, the actual horizontal dimension of pixels must be z. ... the rough relation of x and z is  $z \cos \beta = x$ . Likewise, it is assumed that a point of view is moved by the horizontal angle of view which is indicated by symbol  $\alpha$ . ... The rough relations of x and y is  $y \cos \alpha = x$ ." (see col. 4, lines 6-17 and Figure 4).

However, the discussion of the variables y and z are taken with respect to the horizontal and same axis. Yamazaki fails to provide any teaching regarding information associated with pixel information along an axis orthogonal to the axis along which the pixels lay.

A claim is anticipated if and only if each of the elements recited in the claims is cited in a single prior art reference.

Yamazaki cannot be said to anticipate the subject matter recited in claim 1, as amended, as Yamazaki fails to provide any teaching regarding a second axis.

With regard to the rejection of the remaining claims, these claims depend from independent claim 1 and, hence, are also allowable by virtue of their dependency upon an allowable base claim

Claims 3, 20-23 and 25-26 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki in view of Lamvik.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with and explicitly traverses the rejection of the claims. However, as noted previously, independent claim 20 has been amended in a manner similar to that of claim 1 and, hence, Yamazaki fails to disclose a material element recited in independent claim 20.

Lamvik is recited for teaching the claim element that the sizes of the pixels within a group increase nonlinearly with increasing viewing angle.

However, Lamvik fails to provide any teaching regarding a second axis or the viewing along the second axis as is recited in the claims.

For the amendments made to the claims and for the arguments presented, herein, applicant submits that the combination of Yamazaki and Lamvik fails to disclose at least one material element recited in claim 20. Hence, claim 20 is not rendered obvious by the cited references.

With regard to the rejection of the remaining claims, these claims depend from independent claims 1 and 20 and, hence, are also allowable by virtue of their dependency upon an allowable base claim

With regard to the rejection of the remaining claims under 35 USC 103, these claims depend from independent claims 1 and 20 and, none of the additionally cited references provides any teaching to correct the deficiency found to exist in the teaching of Yamazaki. Hence, each of the remaining claims is also allowable by virtue of its dependency upon an allowable base claim

For the amendments made to the claims and for the remarks made, herein, applicant submits that the reason for the rejections of the claims has been overcome and respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn and a Notice of Allowance be issued.

Applicant denies any statement, position or averment stated in the Office Action that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing. Any rejection and/or points of argument not addressed are moot in view of the presented arguments and no arguments are waived and none of the statements and/or assertions made in the Office Action is conceded.

Applicant makes no statement regarding the patentability of the subject matter recited in the claims prior to this Amendment and has amended claims 1 and 20 and cancelled claims 18, 25, 27 and 28 solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution of this patent application. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue claims, including the subject matter encompassed by the originally filed claims, as presented prior to this Amendment, and any additional claims in one or more continuing applications during the pendency of the instant application.

Should the Examiner believe that the disposition of any issues arising from this response may be best resolved by a telephone call, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's representative at the telephone number listed below.

No fees are believed necessary for the timely filing of this paper.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael E. Belk, Reg. No. 33357

Date: August 6, 2009

/Carl A. Giordano/

By: Carl A. Giordano  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 41,780

**Mail all correspondence to:**

Michael E. Belk, Esq.  
US PHILIPS CORPORATION  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001  
Phone: (914) 333-9643  
Fax: (914) 332-0615

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.8(a)**

The undersigned hereby certifies that this document is being:

Transmitted electronic by the currently available EFS system;  
 Transmitted by facsimile to 571 273 8300;  
 Placed with the US Postal Service with First Class postage attached to the address indicated above;  
on August \_\_\_\_\_, 2009.

---

Print Name

---

Signature